CC:

Melvin I. Stoltz

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Matter of the Application of)
LEONARD PAUL et al)
Serial Number: 10/090,596) Examiner: N. Ogden, Jr.
Filed: March 1, 2002) Group Art Unit 1751)
For: LIQUID FOAMING SOAP COMPOSITION	S)
	Melvin I. Stoltz, Esq. 51 Cherry Street Milford, CT 06460 February 2, 2004

Mail Stop Amendment - FEE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

Applicants' undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Ogden for the helpfulness and courtesy extended during a telephone interview at which time the outstanding Office Action was discussed. Although no conclusions or agreements were

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited today with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Melvin I. Stoltz, Reg. No. 25,934

Date: February 2, 2004

reached during this telephone interview, the Examiner explained the reasons for the issuance of the Office Action as well as the reasons for citing canceled claims. The Applicants believe that the following Response is consistent with the requested information being sought by the Examiner and renders Applicants' previously submitted amendment to be fully responsive to the original Office Action. As a result, the Applicants believe that the Examiner's review of the pending claims can now be completed.

In accordance with the Examiner's request, the Applicants have submitted a Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto, thereby obviating the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims based upon the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. Of course, if any questions remain regarding this issue, or the wording of this Terminal Disclaimer, Applicants' undersigned Attorney would gladly discuss and resolve these issues.

In the Amendment submitted by the Applicants on October 2, 2003, the Applicants canceled Claims 1-16 and 18-23, as originally submitted. In addition, new Claims 24-40 were added. As a result, only originally submitted Claim 17 remains as a pending claim in this application, which claim has been substantially amended. In this regard, Claim 17 has been amended from a dependent claim into an independent claim defining a foam shaving mouse producing composition for use with electric shavers and/or razors which comprises a specific formulation, which is a fully detailed in amended Claim 17.

In the original Office Action mailed July 11, 2003, Claim 17, was rejected, along with all of the pending claims, as being unpatentable over <u>Subramanyam</u> and <u>Fowler</u>. In this rejection, the Examiner cited <u>Subramanyam</u> as disclosing a personal cleansing liquid composition comprising soaps such as sodium/potassium cocoate and stearic acid, as well as a variety of surfactants and water. The Examiner also cited the teaching of germicides as additional components in the formulation of <u>Subramanyam</u>, and specifically relied upon the teaching of <u>Fowler</u> for showing that triclosan can be employed as an antibacterial or a germicide.

The Applicants maintain that the Examiner's arguments as originally presented are now inapplicable to Claim 17, as now amended, due to the substantial changes incorporated into Claim 17. In particular, Claim 17 does not define a self cleansing solution as originally asserted by the Examiner. In its present form, Claim 17 specifically defines a foam shaving mousse producing composition constructed for use with electric shavers and/or razors, having a specific, precisely defined formulation. Clearly, the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the creation of a foam shaving mousse producing composition and furthermore do not teach or suggest the specific quantities for the ingredients identified in Claim 17. As a result, the Applicants believe that Claim 17 clearly and unequivocally distinguishes Subramanyam, Fowler, and all of the remaining cited prior art patents.

The remaining claims presently pending in this application comprise newly added claims, each of which are directed to a foam shaving mousse producing compo-

sition, a foam shaving mousse producing composition and delivery system therefore, or a method for shaving which employs the defined foam shaving mousse formulation.

Since all of the references cited by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed July 11, 2003 are directed to soaps and soap compositions, the Applicants believe that these references are inapplicable to the invention, as now defined in the pending claims.

Furthermore, since the claims now presented are clearly within the original disclosure of the present invention, the Applicants believe that these claims are properly presented and consistent with the Applicants' invention as disclosed.

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicants believe that the issues raised by the Examiner in the Official Action mailed January 22, 2004 have now been fully and completely satisfied and consideration of all of the pending claims on the merits may now proceed. Of course, if any questions remain which can be resolved in a telephone interview, Applicants' undersigned Attorney would gladly discussed such issues with the Examiner at the Examiner's convenience. For this reason, Applicants' undersigned Attorney has provided his telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin I. Stoltz

Registration No. 25,934 Attorney for Applicants

MIS:rpr (203) 874-8183